1 Lisa M. Panahi, Bar No. 023421
General Counsel
State Bar of Arizona
4201 N. 24th Street, Suite 100
Phoenix, AZ 85016-6288
(602) 340-7236

IN THI
STA

IN THE SUPREME COURT STATE OF ARIZONA

In the Matter of:

PETITION TO AMEND THE ARIZONA RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

Supreme Court No. R-20-0031

COMMENT OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA

Pursuant to Rule 28(e) of the Arizona Rules of Supreme Court, the State Bar of Arizona (the "State Bar") hereby submits the following as its comment to the above-captioned Petition. The analysis and details for this Comment are substantially the product of the State Bar's Criminal Practice and Procedure Committee, composed of a balance of prosecution and defense practitioners, and judicial members.

The Petition seeks to modify a vast majority of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure to insert victim rights into most of the rules, while simultaneously maintaining Rule 39 which contains these rights. This is the third such petition

submitted by Arizona Voice for Crime Victims in as many years; its former, similar petitions have been denied. (R-18-001; R-19-0016).

Rule 39 sets forth the rights granted to crime victims as codified in the Victim's Bill of Rights set forth in the Arizona Constitution, article 2, section 2.1 ("VBR") and A.R.S. 13-4401 et. seq., known as the Victim Rights Implementation Act ("VIRA").

Decisions of the Arizona Supreme Court have made clear that victim rights must be narrowly construed to deal only with procedural rules pertaining to victims. *Slayton v. Shumway*, 166 Ariz. 87 (1990). This means those rules that "define, implement, preserve and protect *the specific* rights *unique* and *peculiar* to crime victims as guaranteed and *created by* the VBR." *State v. Brown*, 194 Ariz. 340, 343 (1999); *Champlin v. Sargeant*, 192 Ariz. 371, 373 n. 2 (1998) (rulemaking power under VBR "extends only so far as necessary to protect rights *created by* the [VBR] and not beyond."); *State v. Hansen*, 25 Ariz. 287, 290 (2007) (same).

Like the prior petitions, the instant Petition will effectively expand victim rights to procedural rules which neither pertain to nor directly implicate specific rights unique and peculiar to victims created by VBR. As Petitioner states, the goal of the proposed rule changes is to make "all rules governing criminal procedure" protect victim rights to be heard and to participate in criminal proceedings. (Petition at 5). This aim is inconsistent with the narrow construction given victim rights as it seeks to elevate crime victims to the status of party in a criminal proceeding—which

crime victims are not. *Lindsay R. v. Cohen*, 236 Ariz. 565 (App. 2015) (VBR did not make victims parties). Moreover, Petitioner relies on VBR's general aims of affording victims "due process," as well as its requirement that victims be "treated with fairness, dignity and respect," but these are not rights "created by" VBR. Due process is a right similarly afforded criminal defendants by the federal and state constitutions, while the right to be "treated with fairness, respect and dignity" is afforded *all* participants in the civil and criminal process. *See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct., Rule 81, Canon 2, Rule 2.2* ("Impartiality and Fairness"); *Rule 2.8(B)* ("Decorum, Demeanor..."). Both such rights pre-date the VBR.

Rule 39 of the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure sets forth *all* rights afforded crime victims on matters unique and peculiar to them. Of course, trial courts are bound by and must follow the provisions of that rule. Although Petitioner sets forth five cases in which it claims victim rights were violated by the trial court, whether violations actually occurred in the matters described is not established. Even assuming the facts as stated, every victim has "standing to seek an order, [or] to bring a special action...seeking to enforce any right or to challenge an order denying any right guaranteed to victims." *A.R.S.* §13-4437(A).

CONCLUSION For the reasons stated above, the State Bar of Arizona respectfully requests that this Petition be denied. RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 1st day of May, 2020. /s/ Lisa M. Panahi Lisa M. Panahi General Counsel Electronic copy filed with the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Arizona this 1st day of May, 2020. by: Patricia Seguin